

**Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council
Urbandale Public Library
October 10, 2008
9:00 a.m.**

Minutes

See sign-in sheet for attendees.

9:00 a.m. Meeting Begins

9:15 a.m. Public Participation Period (3 Minutes Per Person)

Approval of Procedural Guidelines Document

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion to approve Unanimous approval

Approval of Agenda

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion to approve Unanimous approval

Approval of Minutes

DECISION ITEM

No discussion

Motion to approve Unanimous approval

Election of Vice-Chair

DECISION ITEM

This person takes the place of the chair in their absence. They also work with chair on procedural items.

We can discuss the position if the rest of the council members show up later.

Tabled for now

Reopened – yes we need a vice-chair.

Nominations:

Sara Bixby

2nd

This person would run the meeting if the chair is gone. The chair would work on procedural items with the vice-chair if necessary.

Move for nominations to cease.

2nd

Vote on Vice-chair – Sara Bixby Unanimous approval – see vote tally sheet
--

Status of 9th Council Member

INFORMATION

14 planning areas expressed interest.

We had a wide range of applications. 3 agencies suggested the same person.

Brian needs to meet with Rich to discuss the nomination.

We want this person to be on board for the meeting on the 28th.

There was a discussion of the size ranges, and what the cut offs are.

Be sure to have someone that is a planning area member representative.

Use of dedicated SWAP Fund for non-salary administrative support

(examples: informational resources, council members' travel expenses, rental of meeting rooms, etc.)

DECISION ITEM

We have \$600,000 estimated in the fund (30% of SWAP money). We have not budgeted. But we actually have money, whereas some other councils don't have any budget. The council has final approval on what's being spent. We need some flexibility to have access to the funds, but we also need to be sensitive to how much is being used for these administrative costs. DNR is tracking these expenditures separate from the other SWAP money.

We could approve the allowable expenses, and the other ones we'd approve as they come up.

Approve expenses related to travel of council members, rental of meeting, rooms, and informational resources

Motion to approve expenditures for these uses

Unanimous approval

**Will add to procedural guidelines

Defining Conflicts of Interest

DECISION ITEM

Code of Iowa has Council Conflict of Interest definition. 597-2.10

We all have conflicts of interests.

You can't vote on something directly affecting your area, but we have to allow people to serve. They need to excuse themselves from the vote on certain issues but we don't want to cut out people making valuable decisions.

Conflict should be disclosed, this is important for oversight.

There needs to be some flexibility in it.

We also need to think about perception of conflicts.

Mary and someone else could work on a conflict of interest statement to look at **next meeting. Shelly will assist. If it gets approved we'll add it to the procedural guidelines.

Should the person be present or can they be excused if there is a conflict of interest?

(Several people disagreed with this.)

We can check in with Ann Preziosi too.

Tabled

Continuous Improvement

DECISION ITEM

Tom sent out an email that discussed continuous improvement. (Page 37)

This is kind of the basis of the whole legislation. We have standards in place, but there's a wide array of where you're at. No matter where you're at on the scale, every agency has a chance to improve themselves.

In an EMS we have an objective with a long term goal...then we have stops along the way. It's a matter of achieving the long term goal. If there are slips then you implement corrective action but you are ultimately still moving towards that goal.

Should we have a couple of people work on this? Sara and Jen can work together on putting together some information they will bring it back to the **next meeting**.

What details are we looking for?

- An objective for what this council is trying to facilitate applicants to achieve
- A policy or more of a rating system (criteria) that we want developed?
- A self-fulfilling objective, we need that included in the definition, something that they determine, but we monitor.
- We can start with a basis and evolve it as we go.

There is going to be rulemaking that will have to discuss this, but we're not close to that point yet. For now we're looking more for guidance. We can review it and react to it.

Planning Area Baseline Data

DISCUSSION

The data will be helpful down the road when we get applications in.

It's hard to capture each area's true system. Be sure to involve the participant/planning area to discuss their systems because they're more complex than what the data shows.

This is more of an idea of what is available and the data we have. It helps us to put together criteria. It wasn't gathered for the purpose of evaluating programs.

We need to be sensitive to where the applicant is, and understand it's hard to capture all the program details due to the complex nature of them.

We discussed the first 6 standards that areas need to address...the data covers that.

This discussion goes into the next agenda item....we need to understand that these complex issues need to be considered as we develop the process.

Pilot Project

- Application

DECISION ITEM

2 step process? We can start by sending out a letter to gauge what applicants are interested and what do they have in place already? And then from there we develop the application.

Why should or shouldn't a planning area be interested in the EMS? We're still preliminary in developing these things, these are things to discuss.

We have a continuous improvement statement. Then we are asking applicants what they think this should be...does this make sense?

The legislation is clear as to what you have to have in place. That's the base for continuous improvement. The incentive is also outlined in the legislation.

Could someone pick only 1 of these 6 baselines to focus on for continuous improvement?

These are all things that we need to discuss.

We need to understand what the reality is with the initial applicants. What are people thinking?

We have also proposed having a workshop to explain what this all is.

After the pilot we will have a better idea, but for now we are developing guidelines up front.

The initial step is to send a letter to all planning areas to gauge their interest in participation. They need to understand that they'd be working with the council and helping to develop the program.

Do we need to list out the characteristics of an ideal applicant(s)? This info may play out based on who we hear from and what they have in place.

Sometimes those that aren't "star players" are the ones that this would be good for.

We could help the ones that need more help.

It's all incremental.

Also, we have those areas that have programs in place, but their diversion is still going down. We'll consider those too.

****Brian Homework:** look at flexibility in the legislation. What things are you doing that would fall under these categories; Water quality and greenhouse gas.

We should wait to send anything out to anyone until we have an agreement on continuous improvement. Jen and Sara will shoot to have something at the next meeting.

They could take 1 of the 6 things to focus on now, but the other 5 are still on their radar.

Everyone needs to identify what their baseline is. Improve based upon their baseline. What is "continuous"?

Could a facility that's not part of a bigger planning area be part of this EMS?

We have 2 huge planning areas: Bi-State and ECICOG. They have multiple landfills.

That would be a lot to take in. Each landfill/county has their own defined service area and programs...would we let 1 county serve as part of the pilot? There was consensus that this would be ok.

Goal Progress is determined on a planning area basis and fees are based upon this.

We'd need to split the service area out on a fee basis.

It's still a step forward even if all members of the planning area don't want to be involved.

****Brian** needs to look into the fees and determine what latitude we have to do this.

The participant gets the benefit of the program, the other landfills would pay based upon their goal progress.

If the whole comp plan is your landfill's service area then the entire planning area could pay the incentive fee....or it would be better if you track just those that are participants and you'd pay 2 different fees based on who is a member and who isn't.

What if there are multiple landfills in 1 planning area that want to participate? We don't want to discourage this, but they'd submit as 1 applicant as part of the planning area.

We want a defined area. As long as we have a defined service area, people could still be eligible. We don't want to penalize an area because they have uninterested parties.

Should we require the entire planning area to be involved so that they have to show improvement in their poor performers too?

We shouldn't force this issue; a governmental agency doesn't have the ability to make someone participate.

A planning area could break apart. We don't want a structure that gives an incentive to break apart the planning area.

We could deny them as the pilot project? But it's not fair to those that want to participate. We need to stay flexible. We shouldn't let the comprehensive plan requirements to get in the way....we're allowed to do something different.

Flow control is the only comprehensive planning sticking point.

We could carve something out in the tonnage fees to figure out how to make each service area pay differently based on if they are a member or not.

We can encourage people to apply. The burden is on the planning area to show how they are going to benefit.

Flexibility is the key. We would consider these possibilities.

Small work groups will work on a lot of things as we go along.

The initial application will be part of the **next meeting** agenda. People can look at the application that we sent out earlier for discussion prior to the next meeting.

- | | |
|--------------|---------------|
| • Submittal | DECISION ITEM |
| • Evaluation | DECISION ITEM |

Scheduling Future Meetings

- October 28, Tuesday starting at 9:00
- November 13, Thursday starting at 12
- December 12, Friday starting at 9:00

Becky will create a "parking lot" item in the minutes.

Parking Lot

Conflict of interest – Mary and Shelly

Continuous Improvement – Sara and Jen

Brian:

- greenhouse gas and water quality research
- look at fees and determine what latitude we have to split a planning area's fees based on service area

We can break up into small workgroups to get some of these things done, and then come back together as a decision item.

We'd like to get the initial application, format, and letter nailed down at the **next meeting**.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn Unanimous approval

Sign In

Solid Waste Alternatives Program Advisory Council

Urbandale Public Library

October 10, 2008 9a.m.

Name	Representing/Organization
Becky Jolly	
Alex Moon	
Brian Tormey	DNR
Jennifer Jordan	
Sara Bixby	Iowa Recycling Association
Reo Menning	South Central Iowa Solid Waste Agency
Jennifer Ryan	Metro Waste Authority
Mary W. Day	ECICOG
Shelly Tenness	ISOSWO
Tom Hadden	IDEO
Shelly Codner	Metro Waste Authority
Brian Tormey	LWE
Matt Eide	DNR
Jim Obradovich	Artistic Waste
Tony Colosimo	ISSWO/IAA
	Artistic Waste.

Decision Item:

Sara Bixby as Vice-Chair

Anthony Colosimo	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Brian Tormey	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Mary Wittry	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Shelene Codner	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Sherry Timmins	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Jen Jordan	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Tom Hadden	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Sara Bixby	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent
Undecided	Yay	Nay	Abstained/Absent